REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, 40-42, and 45-54 were rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1, 10-11, 15, 25-26, 30, 40-41, 45, 47, and 51 have been amended, and claims 46, 50, and 54 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, 40-42, 45, 47-49, and 51-53 remain pending.

Amendments

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 10-11, 15, 25-26, 30, 40-41, 45, 47, and 51 may be found, for example, on pages 12-16 of the originally-filed Specification. There, examples of numerous transition rules are shown, with each transition rule setting at least one display state variable of at least one display state dimension to correspond to at least one display state value (see, e.g., pg. 12, line 15: "onselect="S=4"""). Each display state variable, such as "S" or "T" represents a display state dimension (such as "betting" in the case of "T" – see pg. 13, lines 22-26). Thus, the transition rules are shown as setting the display state variables of the display state dimensions to correspond to one of a number of display state values (such as 1, 2, 3, etc.), which are then used by the client device to determine the display state.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 6, 10-11, 15, 20-21, 25-26, 30, 35-36, 40-41, and 45-54 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,178,432 to *Cook et al.* (hereinafter "Cook") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The rejections of claims 46, 50, and 54 are obviated by their cancellations.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising:

"receiving by a client device, from a remote server, a plurality of display state definitions defining a plurality of instantiations of a user interface of an application for a plurality of display states of the user interface, wherein (1) at least one of the

plurality of instantiations of the user interface corresponds to a multidimensional display state, the at least one instantiation defined by two or more of the plurality of display state definitions, and (2) at least one of the plurality of display state definitions includes a plurality of display cell definitions correspondingly defining a plurality of display cells of a corresponding one of the plurality of instantiations of the user interface, at least one of the plurality of display cell definitions having a transition rule that sets one or more display state variables of one or more display state dimensions to corresponding one or more display state values in response to user interaction with the display cell specified by the at least one of the plurality of display cell definitions, said setting to facilitate determining by the client device a display state of the user interface;

determining locally by the client device, a current display state of the user interface; and

provisioning by the client device, a current instantiation of said user interface in accordance with one or more of the display state definitions associated with the determined current display state."

In contrast, Cook does not disclose, expressly or inherently, transition rules of display cell definitions that set display state variables of display state dimensions to correspond to display state values to facilitate a client device in determining the display state of the user interface. Rather, Cook simply teaches the provisioning of a user interface as a root file comprised of a plurality of display object descriptions describing display objects of the user interface to be rendered, as well as their behaviors, such as visible or not visible. Some of the display objects are organized by structures of the root file, such as groups, wherein each display object of a given group is visible or not visible at the same time. Behaviors of display objects can command some action in regard to other display objects, such as "show" or "play."

Even assuming for the sake of argument that the display object descriptions of Cook read on the display cell definitions of claim 1, Cook still fails to disclose the invention of claim 1. The behaviors of Cook, cited by the Examiner as reading on "transition rules", do not set any sort of display state variables of display state dimensions to correspond to display state values to facilitate determination of the display state. Rather, they simply command actions affecting

other display objects. The end result of both the invention of claim 1 and Cook may well be ultimately the same: a new display state of the user interface where new display objects are visible. But the invention of claim 1 gets to that result by a different route – through the use of display state variables of display state dimensions, the setting of which may indirectly affect various display cells. In contrast, the behaviors of Cook affect display objects directly, making them visible or not visible, playing them or not playing them, etc. Because the display objects are affected directly, no display state variables of display state dimensions are needed or even useful. Thus, Cook not only does not teach the invention of claim 1, but in fact teaches away from it.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Cook under 35 USC §102(e).

Each of independent, amended claims 10, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 40, and 41 includes in substance the same recitations of amended claim 1 discussed above. Thus, for at least the same reasons, independent claims 10, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 40, and 41 are patentable over Cook.

Claims 3-4, 6, 20-21, 35-36, 45, 47-49, and 51-53 depend on claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, or 41, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-4, 6, 20-21, 35-36, 45, 47-49, and 51-53 are patentable over Cook.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 10 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 5, 12, 19, 27, 34, and 42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cook and U.S. Patent No. 6,222,537 to *Smith et al.* (hereinafter "Smith") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Smith fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Cook. Therefore, amended claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, and 41 remain patentable over Cook, even when combined with Smith.

Claims 5, 12, 19, 27, 34, and 42 depend from claims 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, and 41, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Accordingly, claims 5, 12, 19, 27, 34, and 42 are patentable over Cook and Smith, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that remaining claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, 40-42, and 45, 47-49, and 51-53 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: March 19, 2007

by: /Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981